

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION**

FRANK RONNIE HALL,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 3:20-cv-107-MMH-PDB

KILOLO KIJAKAZI,  
Acting Commissioner of  
Social Security,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_/

**ORDER**

**THIS CAUSE** is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 23; Report) entered by the Honorable Patricia D. Barksdale, United States Magistrate Judge, on July 30, 2021. In the Report, Magistrate Judge Barksdale recommends that the Commissioner of Social Security's (the Commissioner) determination that Plaintiff was not disabled be affirmed. See Report at 15. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report on August 12, 2021. See Plaintiff's Objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 24; Objections). The Commissioner responded to the Objections on August 23, 2021. See Commissioner's Response to Plaintiff's Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 25; Response to Objections). Accordingly, this matter is ripe for review.

The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). If no specific objections to findings of facts are filed, the district court is not required to conduct a de novo review of those findings. See Garvey v. Vaughn, 993 F.2d 776, 779 n.9 (11th Cir. 1993); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, the district court must review legal conclusions de novo. See Cooper-Houston v. S. Ry. Co., 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994); United States v. Rice, No. 2:07-mc-8-FtM-29SPC, 2007 WL 1428615, at \*1 (M.D. Fla. May 14, 2007).

The Court has reviewed the Report, the Objections, and the Response to Objections. In the Objections, Plaintiff asserts that “[t]he Social Security Administration improperly failed to implement the reconsideration decision of January 4, 2016,” and that “[t]he ALJ erred in finding Plaintiff could perform medium work.” See Objections at 1, 3. Plaintiff’s arguments in the Objections simply mirror those raised in his original memorandum before the Magistrate Judge with no further elaboration. See Plaintiff’s Memorandum in Opposition to the Commissioner’s Decision (Doc. 21; Plaintiff’s Memo.) at 13-16.<sup>1</sup> Although Plaintiff generally disagrees with the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions, he fails to identify any factual or legal error in the Report.

---

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, most of Plaintiff’s Objections consist merely of verbatim recitation of argument previously set forth in Plaintiff’s Memo. Compare Objections at 3-6, with Plaintiff’s Memo. at 13-16.

Upon independent review of the file in this case, and for the reasons stated in the Report, the Court will overrule the Objections, and accept and adopt the legal and factual conclusions recommended by Judge Barksdale. Accordingly, it is hereby

**ORDERED:**

1. The objections set forth in Plaintiff's Objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 24) are **OVERRULED**.
2. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 23) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.
3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and § 1383(c)(3) **AFFIRMING** the Commissioner's final decision and close the file.

**DONE AND ORDERED** in Jacksonville, Florida this 20th day of September, 2021.

  
**MARCIA MORALES HOWARD**  
United States District Judge

lc27  
Copies to:  
Counsel of Record